

**Steering Committee Minutes**  
**April 26, 2003**

**Steering Committee Members**

Mark Price  
Margarette Morgan  
Tom Weber  
Tim McMaster  
John Elliott  
Shirley Fisher  
Dan Neirinckx  
Gene Helsle  
Rick Smith  
Gil Jemmot  
Terry Glarden  
Joe Chisholm  
Gordon Hammers  
Sam Mitchell  
Lois Jones  
John Ferguson  
Jack Phillips  
Larry Glavinic

Alpine  
Bonsall  
Borrego  
Crest / Dehesa/ H.C.  
Descanso  
Jacumba  
Jamul/ Dulzura  
Julian  
Lakeside  
Twin Oaks  
Pine Valley  
Pala-Pauma  
Potrero  
Ramona  
San Dieguito  
Spring Valley  
Valle de Oro  
Valley Center

**Planning Commissioner**

Bryan Woods

**Staff**

Tom Harron  
Ivan Holler  
Rosemary Rowan  
Sandy Gillins  
Howard Blackson  
Dahvia Locke  
Karissa Selvester

**Public**

Charlene Ayers  
David Black  
Hank Palmer  
Richard Smith  
John Stewart  
Mike Tometz  
Patrick Uriell  
Dutch VanDierendonck  
Jan VanDierendonck  
Ron White

**Meeting commenced at approximately 9:10 a.m.**

## INTRODUCTIONS

**Woods:** We do have a quorum. We have a somewhat ambitious agenda this morning, so let's get right into it.

**Holler:** I'm going to switch a little bit and talk about Item #4 first on your agenda. There has been a change in the Board schedule. The first date at the Board now will be May 21<sup>st</sup>. The May 7<sup>th</sup> date is off. I don't yet have a second hearing date established- I'm thinking that will be June 11<sup>th</sup>. We should have that worked out by Tuesday of next week. The Chair is looking to have similar proceedings as with the PC (explains logistics of hearing).

*A brief discussion of the Board of Supervisors hearing dates and logistics ensued.*

**Elliott:** What do you hope to achieve at the BOS hearing? What kind of vote are you going to ask for?

**Holler:** Essentially we are asking for the same direction as what came out of the Planning Commission. That is to accept the work products- the Map, the Framework, etc.- as a work in progress with the understanding that it will be subject to further refinement. We have a second recommendation. The Commission gave us a list of property referrals and we will be asking the Board to give us specific direction to complete that review and then return with those recommendations to the communities, to the Interest Group, and take those back to the Board. For now, there will not be any changes to the maps. They'll be exactly the same as what went to the Commission. The intent is that the Board would give us direction or a recommendation indicating that we are generally going in the right direction.

**Glavinic:** Has the Interest Group voted to support the map? Is this something that this group should be on record for so the Board of Supervisors might know what an elected group's opinion is and not just a non-elected group?

**Holler:** That's an option. We have relied on the actions from the individual communities in stating their position. That may be a more appropriate way to do it given that each representative has comments on their specific community.

**Woods:** I don't think I have a problem with this group voting as a whole to accept the map (with further refinement). I think it is an appropriate consideration.

**Jones:** I think that it is difficult to have a vote like that since we are waiting for things that came out of the Planning Commission.

**Phillips:** The Interest Group are "special interests" that would vote on the map if it met their special interests. To ask me to vote on what you're doing in [another community] is problematic. We started this process with the idea that we would set up a basic framework but that the communities would have a lot of individual methods for building the community the way they want it. I don't want to put us in a position- especially when one of the Planning Groups has a problem with what's on that map- I would find it objectionable to ask me to vote to support the staff position that may be on the map.

**Woods:** I see your point. It's not on our agenda to ask for that and it is problematic. Maybe we should just take it off the table.

**Hammers:** None of us can represent another's community. For someone from a different community to say that they don't like what is going on in Potrero is inappropriate and none of their business. If someone says, "this is what my community wants", I'm willing to accept that. I think it would be appropriate to have a resolution if we accept it with the refinements recommended by each of the communities.

**Holler:** Let me clarify. The Planning Commission had several areas they referred back to the staff (about 85). It may be more appropriate to wait until we have an opportunity to meet with the representatives of the communities as a part of the resolution to those before we take an action on that.

**Hammers:** I appreciate that. But, to me it's frustrating to work hard to have the community come up with a position and then we turn our backs and somebody else takes a pen and changes it. At some point in time, we have to say, "there is a process and the process is open and in front of us" and not hiding in the shadows someplace.

**Holler:** Just to be clear, the way that the maps look right now is the same as they looked at the Planning Commission, so there has been no change. Part of the difficulty that we have in terms of resolving the number of areas that have been referred is that we have to look at those in context. If a change is proposed in a particular area, we have to look and see if there are adjacent parcels or areas that may be appropriate to be changed- or if a change here would be detrimental or inconsistent. So it is going to take some work on our part. I'm going to suggest that, as it is not on the agenda, we not do this.

**Woods:** Let's move forward off of the topic.

**Glavinic:** What do I tell people who are looking for the opportunity to be a part of the referrals?

**Holler:** There is still opportunity and we will be working with the groups to address [the referrals]. The door is still open.

**Price:** One thing that concerns me with this group not taking a position is that, in the minds of some, the Interest Group is looked at as a counterbalance to this group. Since they have taken a position as a unified group, it just seems that we are in a position where we are being divided and conquered. I think that it makes sense [to take a vote]. I wish that it wouldn't go before the Board without the referrals being addressed, because at that point I might be able to vote to support the map. I would hate to go forward with the Supervisors thinking that this group either supports or denies the map without us taking a vote.

**Phillips:** I fully expect that at the Board hearing there will be more referrals and the Board will make those very directly. Don't expect this to be a consideration of the map as it is plus the Planning Commission referrals. We're going to have the various special interests trying to get what they want at the highest political level. The second thing is that one of the most important issues in front of the Board will not be at that hearing- [that is] Policy I-63. I hope that all of you will be there on Wednesday and support retention of Planning Group's authority and power in their own Community Plan. Loss of I-63 is going to negate anything that we do here. It is going to set up an autocratic system where General Plan Amendments are shoved down our throats. I-63 needs our support next Wednesday...it is our future.

**Holler:** I recommend that we move on to the rest of the items that on our agenda.

**Woods:** I-63 is a very important issue. It is a general issue. And, yes, go [to the Board and] speak your mind.

**Harron:** We need to move to the items that are on the agenda. We were okay to start the item, but the discussion has gone on too far into items that were not on the agenda.

**Sam:** With all due respect, I think these issues need to be taken care of before we go further- I think it would create a better feeling between the communities and staff, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. I don't see happy people sitting here. I hear comments that really need attention.

**Woods:** We're going to move on to the agenda.

We're going to go on to Item 2. I wanted to read the two motions that were made at the Planning Commission (we had four hearings). We had two unanimous votes- the first was on January 31<sup>st</sup>, the second was on March 7<sup>th</sup>. The motion that was put on the floor was to, "Support the direction of General Plan 2020 and accept it with the Planning Concepts, Land Use Framework, and Statements of Legislative Intent, for continued refinement and progress". That's what the Board is going to be asked to do, also. Secondly, in a separate motion, we voted to, "Accept the draft Goals and Policies and support the progress subject to review as part of a complete package, the policy statements within the Regional Elements". On the 7<sup>th</sup>, the final vote on the subject was to, "Recommend that the Board of Supervisors support the direction of GP2020 and accept the Regional Structure Map and Regional Land Use Map for continued refinement and progress". In addition, the items of the Referrals (which totaled 85), were accepted by the Commission and basically recommended that they go before staff to be sent to the Planning Groups for their comments and votes, and that they be brought back to the Commission and eventually to the Board. We want the Planning Groups input [the Referrals Matrix is handed out to Planning Group representatives]. Eventually, the Board is going to decide what to do with this.

**Larry:** I have a procedural question. It seems to me that the Planning Commission took a position before hearing public testimony and that bothered me. Is that standard?

**Woods:** I beg to differ on that. The Commission doesn't take a position on anything until all of the testimony is done and all of the discussion and all of the information has been placed on the table. The Commission really only takes a position with public testimony in mind... and I can tell you that we work our decisions to death. No, I don't think there was a preconceived notion of where we were going to go.

**Jack:** I found the process of Referrals to be remarkable because one Commissioner could simply say "review that" and then staff would be off and running. The fact that these actions were taken was very obnoxious. You should have let the chairs respond. I think that it should have been structured differently so it wasn't just one Commissioner's preference going forward.

**Woods:** I did not anticipate that we would go to that level, but once the ball started rolling... The question was, "Are you going to try to evaluate each of these on a case by case basis in this forum?". We couldn't go into detail on all of them, but it was important for them to be accommodated and just have a second look. The only solution at that time without discussing the merits of their request was to send it back to staff without spending hours- unprepared hours- to

try to evaluate this. These are not each a part of GP2020, they are just requests for reconsideration.

**Phillips:** Tell me now that they're not going to be carried forward to the final hearings just because they were submitted.

**Woods:** My understanding is that staff is going to go and visit each one of those 85 projects and come back with a recommendation. They're going to send those 85 projects back to individual communities for their comment and recommendation. And then they're going to come back through the entire process of the Planning Commission and that recommendation will go to the Board for a final decision.

**Ferguson:** I got a request that had gone to the Planning Commission from a landowner in my Planning Area who wanted an upzone. I took that to be informational. I assumed in due course we'll get something more formal. Was that an indication that we should hold a hearing on that?

**Pryor:** Let me clarify. The Planning Commission tossed the hot rock to us. Yes, we're obligated to inform the Board that those requests were made. They are not part of the map. What's going is what you looked at. That list will come back to you. You're now going to be obligated to analyze it independently and give your recommendation to either kill it or do something with it. We're not going to make that decision without your input. We're going to advise the Board of the list and the process. We're going to get the input and make a recommendation. At that time, the Commission will have to make a decision and so will the Board. But at least they'll be doing that with the input from the Planning Groups and with staff's recommendation. We're not going to let this get away from the Planning Groups. You'll get the list of Referrals today and you can take that back. I'll assume that you'll have a meeting within the next month. We'll give everyone a chance to have at least one meeting before we review and bring your input back.

**Woods:** We don't want to leave anyone out. When we're done everyone should be satisfied that they had an opportunity to give input about their land and their community.

**Glavinic:** Let's assume we've already heard it and that the Planning Group made their decision. Now we're getting a second evaluation and our decision does not change. Who is the final arbiter?

**Pryor:** I will be as a department. It will have to be the Planning Department that says, "Is the request reasonable? Can we service it? Does it do what the Concept laid out and accomplished?". We will make an independent recommendation. Your recommendation and ours may or may not agree. But, either way, both recommendations will go to the Board. We have not put a staff position on this list yet [referring to Referral list].

**Helsle:** At the Planning Commission, one of the motions was to accept the Goals and Policies that we've worked on up to this point. Are those the Goals and Policies that have come out of the Steering Committee or Interest Group or staff- or an amalgamation?

**Holler:** This group has taken previous actions on Goals and Policies and the Interest Group has taken a position on Goals and Policies. In many cases, the Goals and Policies are very, very similar even though the wording may be different. There are a few cases, however, where the Goal or Policy of the Interest Group conflicts with what has come out of this group previously. Those are some things that we will need to resolve in the future. We presented both in the Commission and Board packets (for further refinement).

**Woods:** At the last hearing staff did an overview (consisting of “Competition for Land”, “Housing Affordability”, and “Balancing the General Plan”). I think the meat of it goes down to balancing the General Plan, which is essentially what our work is going to be in the future in balancing the Land Use Distribution map with the seven Elements. That kind of work is going to be the challenge for us in the future and will involve more of our Saturday mornings. The way that I believe that it will be formatted is that we will have one to two Commission hearings on each one of the Elements (probably one on several of them). We’ll do all the work here first and then those recommendations will be sent on to the Board. Traffic, circulation, etc.- all of these issues will be on the table. So, we’ll get to the meat of what that [Land Use Distribution] map really says. We should have some interesting meetings in the future.

**Morgan:** What happened at the Commission hearing [with regard to the map]?

**Woods:** Karen Scarborough announced that the Interest Group voted to support the one that we created- only in concept with further refinements. So, they didn’t bring a separate map to the table for us to look at. What it did for the process was that it really put us all on the same page.

**Helsle:** I think the Interest Group has resolved their referral issues. Once they did, they were able to accept that map. I think we are in a different position because we have 85 referrals outstanding that may affect the composition of that map. Once that map is refined, is that going to go back to the Interest Group?

**Chisholm:** A lot of those issues could be solved if we figured out some of the equity issues [equity mechanisms]. That really gets to the heart of what some of those people are looking for.

**Woods:** In the final presentation, that was one of the issues that was identified that needed to be resolved. With that, let’s move on to town center planning.

**Holler:** The next item is one that we have discussed here superficially and will have application to most of the work of the Planning Group Areas, although not all. However, even if your community is, for example, in the Backcountry, there are pieces of this that could be beneficial for your community. Essentially, this is providing an opportunity to create a traditional town center/ downtown area in your community that includes the opportunity for mixed uses. This is something that the Department has worked on with Fallbrook and that item has been to the Board- the Fallbrook Revitalization Plan. A program has been developed for Lakeside that is similar to that. This has application in other communities and we have been working with other communities specifically on this, such as Valley Center and Ramona. But, it has application to probably almost every Planning Group Area. This is not a mandatory program, but it is certainly something that is an option if your community would like to take advantage of it to preserve or enhance the community character. Or, as in the case of Fallbrook, provide some opportunities for economic revitalization primarily through zoning issues. Howard and Rosemary will be making a presentation on this.

**Hammers:** When you say “mixed use”, do you mean something like “C4” and “SR4” combined?

**Holler:** We’re really talking about the option of having residential uses in a downtown area. That could happen in different ways, including in a more traditional way with folks living on the second story above commercial uses.

**Hammers:** This could be a hit in my community.

**Holler:** I don't want us to get hooked on zones that we have today. What we did in Fallbrook was to create new zone types. New zones can be made to accommodate the concepts of these town centers. There really is an opportunity to tailor these zones to the specific community. We need to make sure that things that exist today are not impediments. Maybe we should look at utilizing new options that we aren't able to get to today. Before I get too far into this, I'm going to let Howard take it from here and then we can take more questions.

**Blackson:** I'm going to speak to page 4 & 5 of the handout that was given on Town Center Planning handout. We're trying to create walkable town centers and creating a balance to bring residents back into the town center. We are not reinventing the wheel. People are doing this throughout California and the rest of the nation. In terms of location, these principles transcend scale- from Ramona's Main Street to Julian's Main Street. They are different places, different communities, with the same principles and patterns. In the physical aspect of design and planning, we are trying to create a sense of place. We can use codes to talk about places and transportation and how they work together [passes around diagrams illustrating examples of the physical aspect of coding]. As Ivan said, don't get stuck on the existing zones, because we're going to have to rework how we apply these in a town center as opposed to in a rural area. [question re: "FAR"s] We previously spoke about "Floor Area Ratios", "FARs", which is what we use to measure intensity for Commercial and Industrial areas like we use density to measure intensity for residential areas.

On page five, "What are a town center's primary components?". All of these components can be found throughout the County. They're mixed use neighborhoods that are walkable in scale and character and these are building blocks for town centers- neighborhoods. Historic examples are all over the County- Jacumba, Lake Morena, Ramona, Julian, Fallbrook, Rancho Santa Fe. These are all historic places, as well. The planning today has lead to traffic congestion, separation of social classes, suburban sprawl and inefficient land consumption, and limited choices in housing and mobility. So, we need to try to change the codes that we have using these basic traditional principles. They're not new, but they're illegal to build today. These principles are based on the simple structure of traditional towns and villages. The patterns provide a far more attractive and satisfactory way of life, as polls show us lately. It creates a more cost-efficient and balanced pattern, as well. Our handout shows how this and General Plan 2020 fits within the Board of Supervisors Strategic Initiative for Livable Communities.

**Glavinic:** I like the term "walkable" but I have no clue what the definition is.

**Blackson:** It's a quarter mile radius, or a five to ten minute walk depending on the topography [quotes Kevin Lynch].

**Hammers:** One of the things that should be added to the list of benefits is that it allows the free market to better play in developing what is needed in the community, instead of simple planning.

**Rowan:** We have held workshops in Harmony Grove (in San Dieguito) and have scheduled workshops in Ramona and Valley Center. What I'd like to explain is how all of this fits into the GP2020 process. A lot of planning that needs to occur at a town center level is way too detailed for the General Plan. On the other hand, there are things that we have to consider now and we also have to set up the system so that zoning changes can be made later on. Right now there is no system for handling town center development- which is why Fallbrook has to go to the Board and ask for a General Plan Amendment to develop their own zoning. We don't have a prototype for communities to take off the shelf and use. Our goal is to

[create that] as a part of this process. I'd like to explain how this fits into 2020 and also what would have to happen later on if communities are interested in doing this. Just to explain a "town center"- most of the town centers (at least those West of the CWA) will be in Village or Village Core areas in terms of the Regional Category Structure. The Land Use Designations that are most closely associated with the town centers are the medium and high density residential, the General Commercial, and, in some cases, Light Industrial. At the regional plan level, in the Land Use Element, we have to define what a town center is, what its components typically would be, and what types of locations are appropriate for town center development, etc.... That will also include some smaller, more rural communities that might not have Villages- they may have lower density residential development but also a commercial center. We'll have to define it broadly enough so that it encompasses the very broad types of communities that we have. In the Regional Plan, we're also going to have to describe how we would implement town centers. We'll have to develop a town center ordinance as a part of the Implementation Plan for GP2020. We'll also have to look at our Road Standards because the road standards that we have today are concerned with moving traffic. In a town center, we have some other concerns as well- maybe even slowing the traffic down and issues like landscaping, sidewalk design, etc. In your Community Plans, if you know that you want to have a town center, you may want to pay attention to where you want to have that so that you can make sure that your Land Use Designations are going to be appropriate (set up for appropriate zoning). If you desire, you can put together Community Plan policies- we did this in Lakeside. That's really up to a community and it can be done later. We're not looking, necessarily, for exact locations, but you can define the general location where this would be in your community (plant the seed in the Community Plan) so that later on when you are ready to do the detailed planning you don't need to do a General Plan Amendment. One of the most important things is implementation and that's where the Town Center Ordinance would come into play. It would include two really important things; 1) Prototypes for zoning districts (these can be customized per community later), and 2) Design Standards/ Guidelines (commercial and residential). This is really important to have. Without the Design Standards, development is not going to happen in the way that you envision. There's a certain amount of this that can happen in your community at this point in time. However, if you don't have a clear idea of how you'd like to do this, that's not to say that you can't do this after GP2020 is over because, at the regional level, we'll be setting the structure up for communities to do this. In the last page of the handout we gave you some examples of how zoning for a town center may be different (setbacks, height limits, parking, allowable uses, etc.). An important component of this is the height limit within a town center. Some communities now have two story height limits and, in some cases, that might be appropriate. In others, you cannot get the intensity that you need to generate a true town center environment. So, that is an overview of the regulatory aspects of town center planning.

**Woods:** In the closeout presentation by staff, they talked about housing affordability. Home ownership is unaffordable to 74% of households today. We have a responsibility to look into options to address this. The town center option provides an opportunity to do this.

**Morgan:** We don't have a need for sidewalks, curbs, and gutters. May we have language in GP2020 that says that we don't have to comply with those standards in order to reflect our more rural character?

**Pryor:** What you really need is make sure that you have enabling legislation (language in the General Plan) that will allow you to do that *[tapes inaudible]*.



**Morgan:** *[Comment regarding cell sites.]* Our [design guidelines] have not been updated for 18 years.

**Pryor:** It becomes a question for the community—how far do they want to take them (design guidelines)?

**Woods:** With regards to the Ramona example—they have design guidelines, but if Ramona wants to put in some housing (i.e. senior housing) they will have to revisit the guidelines.

**Morgan:** Should we do this now? I'm concerned that future development will come in after GP2020 and try to use our antiquated design guidelines that aren't going to be able to sustain what we are trying to go for in our community.

**Holler:** It's probably premature now.

**Pryor:** You've got a current problem with cell sites. Updating your design guidelines is a bigger issue. At this point in time, you're probably going to have to rely on your existing tools. Can you modify them? Yes- but doing that will perhaps slow down other parts of the process.

**Price:** Thank you for the presentation. Alpine supports this. We're trying to do this, anyways, but we're doing it piecemeal. We've already voted to downsize the road and work in the direction outlined [in the town center handout]. I have two questions. If you already have a design review board, will these be the same standards or will this require additional standards?

**Pryor:** That's up to you. When you get into mixed use, you probably will have to develop additional standards, etc. *[provides examples]*.

**Price:** The last comment that I have is, to make any of this work, you still have to get back to fixing the procedures that are in place. For example, here in Alpine the Board has approved an apartment complex with 1/3 less dwelling units than are allowed in the town center. Because of problems with the process through the County, [the developer] is so frustrated that he now wants low-income housing. I don't think that's in the best interest of the community.

**McMaster:** Would a town center ordinance be part of the community plan?

**Rowan:** No, [it should be] included in the Implementation Plan. We will have to create some ordinances specifically for GP2020. That will happen within what is called "a reasonable time" after the adoption of our General Plan [see page 6 and 9 of Town Center Planning handout].

**Woods:** It would go into the zoning ordinance identified by your community.

**Glavinic:** I'm very supportive of the notion of Country Towns and we're trying to make this happen. I have two concerns: 1) Will the ordinance address public safety issues in mixed use/ impact areas (police, after hours, etc.)? Will an automatic assessment come into play? 2) Will there be a means of enforcement/ teeth in design guidelines/ standards (we don't have that now). We want to avoid non-compliance due to a lack of enforcement.

**Pryor:** We'll have good, clear ordinances and standards and codes will be enforced [gives example]. Code enforcement folks do have the power to levy fines, etc.

**Holler:** Larry- the first part of your question was, essentially, how do we make sure that we're able to provide essential services. That's a huge issue. And that's a General Plan issue. That's exactly what a big part of what we're doing needs to ensure- that is that the land use is balanced with our ability to provide infrastructure and essential services. So, that is a concern not simply with town centers but with the whole region. Now we get into Implementation programs that have to include methods to finance these things. That's where each of you as members of the community will need to recognize that increases in density or intensity or trying to simply not exacerbate the deficits that are on the ground today and financing this is a huge challenge.

**John:** [Comment on code enforcement. Question regarding town center economics, commercial and residential land uses, and trips generated from outside the community- how they affect town centers and the economic viability of the town center.]

**Rowan:** The residential component is part of the economics of the town center as well as the commercial areas. You need to have some residential density to support the commercial development— I'm not sure that we have exact numbers.

**Pryor:** This depends on the size of the community, etc. I think it goes to the issue of the free market system. If there are enough rooftops there to support a small store or gas station it's going to come into play. What you need to do is look at it and determine if you also want that location to have the ability to mix its uses so that the free market can work more easily in that community. What you're really trying to do in that town center (depending on the community- particularly with regard to traffic circulation) is going to vary.

**Hammers:** (regarding financing) The thing I like about this is that you can set up a community service zone and have it dormant and it kicks in when it gets to a certain level so that the last guy in doesn't end up paying for everything). Everybody who moves it closer to that trigger is going to pay a fee. So that when the services are needed and the infrastructure is large enough to support it, it's there. You put that in from day one so that everyone is a part of it.

**Break. 10:30 am.**

**(Public) P. Uriel:** Ramona had a terrible experience building high density with minimal infrastructure. For fifteen years we have not been able to bring the roads up to snuff and have not been able to do anything with the units. I'm not saying it will happen again, but something is going to have to be done to make up for that because we're starting with a huge deficit.

**Woods:** The deficit is all around. Good planning today is not going to solve all of the problems of the past. It's not an easy solution, but if we don't try then things will never change.

**Helsle:** In looking at town centers, I think it's important also to look at the activity that takes place in that town center regarding infrastructure. There is a big difference in Julian versus other communities (i.e., Julian is tourist-driven). We have to really begin to look at the functionality of that town center and the specific infrastructure needs that town center is going to have. Hopefully we can use these concepts to solve town center problems.

**Pryor:** If we are doing our job correctly we will be addressing those issues.

**Phillips:** I want you all not to forget where we are. Most of us are in the boon-docks and connectivity for the success of these walkable town centers concepts is all-important. We don't

have connectivity right now. The auto rules whether the planners want it to or not, and it shall continue to rule- if not for shopping, then for work. Support for commercial requires a lot more than a few high-density residential units around it. We have this case in two of our communities. Rancho San Diego is a good example of town center planning, however it is questionable even with the thousands of apartments and condominiums that are there, if it would survive if it didn't have regional anchor/sites to bring in outside traffic. This works in places like Hillcrest or North Park, but these are very different than the unincorporated County. We get no code enforcement in the County. We don't have adequate protection for the mixed use development, because that kind of development intensity will bring more crime.

**Woods:** I don't agree with everything you're saying. We don't have to have big box retail to have successful commercial. I think you can have walkable communities that have the advantage of being located near amenities without having to get in your vehicle for everything you do.

**Phillips:** I'm saying that when you move these things out into the unincorporated County, people still don't get rid of their cars because they need them to get to work. We have not talked about roads and parking standards. We still haven't addressed recreation. If you superimpose higher intensity to achieve the standards of town center planning in an area like Casa de Oro, there is no recreation. This leads to crime and other problems. Without that and related services, you develop a community that starts to decline.

**Hammers:** Thank Jack for making my case for the need for CSDs in some of these areas.

**Chisholm:** I assume that we can solve some of these issues now, but from a more proactive planning standpoint, I think we shouldn't be hindered from developing the best town centers that we can. The dilemma of waiting for things is that town center planning goes beyond planning for one parcel- it's hard to get individual property owners on the right page in the future. [Comments on timing within which regulations come into play. *Inaudible.*] We need to commit some resources from the planning department to help these things get planned. [Also comments on storm water management.]

**Pryor:** The Department has been charged with doing storm water management.

**Woods:** Any last minute comments?

**Ferguson:** I have to support Jack. I have the highest density in the whole county. We can't get started unless you have some guarantees on infrastructure when we start- we can't do it retroactively.

**(Public) H. Palmer:** I think the goals that I heard are very worthwhile. In our case, we'll never walk to Escondido so I think that some of the comments on walkability are just not going to happen. CUDA and FUDA have disappeared without replacement.

**Dutch:** Rancho San Diego is not walkable. I've been there and I can compare it to places to all over the world.

**Pryor:** Because we are talking about it, everyone seems to think that they have to do it, but not everyone will end up doing it. It might not be suitable to every community.

**Mitchell:** I grew up in a walkable community. Would I want to go back to it now? No. If you're a senior citizen it might be a good idea.

**Rowan:** For the workshops that we will be doing for some of your communities...we will be doing a more detailed presentation that will address some of the concerns that you have brought up today.

**Woods:** Let's move on to the draft goals and policies of Conservation Subdivisions (Land Use Framework, Clustering, p. 9).

**Rowan:** We wanted to get your input on these draft goals and policies.

**Phillips:** Parcel based yield makes a difference in achievable density of about 25% on average. You are giving an automatic density increase over parcel-based distribution of lots. I'm saying we should use that as a criteria. A lot of communities say that what could be achieved on that ground with a hypothetical parcel-based subdivision and then you say that's the maximum number of units that you can then cluster. Also subtracted from that should be significant floodplain or steep slope areas. We should insert densities that exceed parcel based subdivision guidelines or increases in Plan densities.

**Ferguson:** Clustering is potentially disastrous for the reasons that Jack cited. It provides an incentive to rip things up and create something that is totally out of character with the community. I would just change it to "discourage". I'm going to vote against it because, seven months ago when this issue was first raised, I got Gary to assure me that- point by point- we'll come back and show how the new policies, standards, etc., would deal with the issues that are already addressed in the existing- so they would all be handled point by point. Never happened.

**Pryor:** That is just not true. We sat here and drew diagrams for you on this thing and you sat here and looked at them. We walked you through how the density could work with the reductions and the same protections.

**Jones:** At one of the previous meetings we got into a discussion of the word "clustering". We were going to develop a different word to use, because "clustering" has a bad connotation. The definition of "clustering" as we see it today is really a very horrible thing. It doesn't work. It gets shoved at us in the rural areas. It puts suburban communities into rural environments. I think that it would behoove us to change the word "clustering" and find something that provides a better definition.

**Rowan:** The word in the goal should be "Conservation Subdivisions" and not "clustering". We do need to define the difference between those two fairly carefully.

**Woods:** I think that "clustering" is only going to be used when you move past the idea of conservation planning and you move into a full on subdivision that is all clustered up relative to what we are talking about here. If you look at the matrix, there is a difference between "clustering" and "Conservation Subdivisions" and the amount of review that it requires.

**Jones:** Look at the definition of "clustering"- based on our experience with clustering, it is a very scary thing to us as a Planning Group.

**Pryor:** I would suggest that in that goal, you take out "clustering" altogether. Because what you're really trying to define under the "Conservation Subdivision" is well-designed projects that utilize techniques to provide the open space. That is different than clustering because clustering

implies that you are going to change minimum lot size and reduce it down in order to really make a compact type of development. There is a difference between the two.

**Hammers:** I've spent a lot of time in meetings trying to explain that the clustering of today is not the same as the clustering that earned a bad rap in the past. I think that by changing it to a different term, I might not have to spend so much time defending the concept.

**Nierenckx:** I have similar concerns as Jack. Looking at "Note 1" (bottom of page 9) that talks about land use standards, etc. The Jamul/ Dulzura area would obviously be affected by septic- whether the area would perc. or not. I'm concerned that the examples that are included may include septic, but that they may create unworkable situations with this kind of density.

**Woods:** Does everyone agree with the change to the *goal* that is being proposed, not on Policy 1. The proposal is to change the goal to say: "Well- designed projects that utilize conservation techniques to provide open space benefits". Is that adequate?

**Smith:** What about adding "permanent"? I'm concerned about leaving these chunks of open land. Someone could get really creative down the road when they get more advanced with their building techniques and start developing these areas (especially on the ridgeline).

**Van Dierendonck:** Conservation techniques are clearly spelled out. And conservation techniques include the conservation, dedication, deeding, etc. to entities that will maintain them in perpetuity.

**Rowan:** If you look at proposed Policy 11, some of the policies address some of the issues that you're talking about. The policies get into some of the issues that you're talking about. The policies get into this level of detail. The goal is very general.

**Morgan:** My first question is about ridgelines, which don't seem to have a definition any place (I would like to have a definition- Woods asks staff to define or look into this). Also, what have we actually done about open space and the potential definitions that we were working with? We were talking about it going to either a conservancy, or land management, or home owners associations. Where are we going with those?

**Rowan:** The proposed policies address that in a more general way. What you're discussing, Margarete, would have to be developed at the ordinance level. But if you look at some of the proposed policies (10, 11) it doesn't necessarily say how you're going to [protect open space], but it says you need to do it.

**Pryor:** There are many kinds of open space and ways to get it. *(Discusses the various options noted in Land Use Framework Clustering document).*

**Morgan:** What about the golf course definition of open space?

**Pryor:** That's an "open space", but it's a commercial activity when you get down to it. It functions as open space, but it's not the same as you'd have for a dedicated type of open space or one that has no buildable potential. *(Brief discussion ensues.)*

**Motion: (Phillips) VOTE on changing Goal wording to—“*Well designed projects that utilize conservation techniques to provide open space*”. 10 in favor. 5 opposed. (Addition of the word “permanent” will be addressed in proposed policies).**

**(Public) H. Palmer:** I support a “well designed project”. But what makes it a “well designed project”?

**Pryor:** There will be ordinances and standards when you go to apply the Conservation Subdivision. It won’t be a by-right kind of thing.

**Smith:** I want to make a statement as to why I opposed the motion. The purpose of the proposed policies is to provide open space benefits. (*Inaudible- preferred language stated below by R. Rowan.*)

**Rowan:** So you would have preferred wording that would have said, “well-designed projects that utilize techniques to provide open space.”

**Pryor:** There’s more than one technique. I think that’s what Rick was getting to.

**Helsle:** What element are we working on?

**Rowan:** This would be either in the Land Use Element or the Conservation/ Open Space elements.

**Woods:** Point well taken. Let’s move on to Policy 1. Let’s take these in order.

**MOTION: (Phillips) Policy 1 language change.**

**From:** “Clustering should be encouraged, provided it does not produce increases in planned densities.”

**To:** “Clustering may be allowed, provided it does not produce densities that exceed parcel-based subdivision yield or increases in planned densities.”

**Pryor:** The latter becomes problematic. The footnote takes care of that.

**Phillips:** The footnote does not. This is practically saying that every parcel within the County can achieve a 25% increase in yield.

**Pryor:** You don’t have to do that. If you take your Conservation Subdivision and you’re setting a minimum lot size and minimum open space requirement that doesn’t necessarily entitle them to max out. Now, you can if you set your minimum parcel size low enough- you could- I agree- you could do that. Even if you go to where you can’t get your full yield with the minimum lot size that you’ve set for that district, what you wind up with is that in order to do what you’re talking about they may have to go to a re-zone and actually apply for the re-zone to a clustered development project. In that case, they could max-out.

**Phillips:** What it does is it forces the developer to do a straw man parcel-based plan. We have talked developers into doing this to show us what the actual yield of the site would be and then we base his clustered development on that maximum that could be put there without clustering.

**Pryor:** Yes it does, because it sets a maximum density.

**Holler:** One of the things that we have said for some time is that the desire has been to decouple the lot size and the density. That one to one relationship leads to a lot of goofy subdivision layouts because the designer is forced into bad layouts. So we are trying to provide the opportunity for folks to come forward with better proposals.

**Phillips:** That decoupling is something that will be a surprise to all of the people in my community. They expect when they read 2 du/ ac in the General Plan, they expect a half-acre subdivision. If you say we're going to really decouple it, then I've got a problem with it. Yeah, we've decoupled it on clustered development, we've approved these projects going through the Major Use Permit findings. They turn out to be pretty good projects. They surprise the hell out of our constituents, though, when they see these little quarter acre lots in a 1-acre area and people really don't want to see that because of the community character change. Base the density on the achievable density or the maximum density in the planning documents. But, the achievable density is very important in our area because we've got slopes all over the place and when you actually go to develop parcel size projects in our area, 25% is probably a low number for how much you're going to lose just to build roads, etc..

**Pryor:** First, the density does not include the roads. More importantly, if you're concerned in your area that you're going to run into that, just reduce the density by 25%. Density gives you a basis upon which you can plan for roads, sewer, water, and schools. That tells you what your population is going to be - reasonably close- within any jurisdiction. If you go the route you're talking about, you're going to be building 25% more roads, sewer and water lines, and paying for that, because that's what shows in the general plan as the density. Then you're turning around and saying we're really not going to get there but we're going to overbuild everything.

**Phillips:** You can't be that precise because there is not 25% between the categories in our toolbox.

**(Public) C. Ayers:** What happened at the Interest Group when they discussed this? I understood it that if a builder did not use all of his density, it would create a flux area in which they could come in later and build.

**Pryor:** That occurs today. A good example of that is the Salvation Army project that is being proposed. They're not developing all of their land but they're not required to deed that to open space so it's going to remain as an undeveloped piece of land at this time. On the other hand, if they do use their density, anything else that's left as open space becomes unbuildable. They can't come back in and convert it at a future date. It's a phasing of the development of the land they own. They may not want to develop it all at one time, but they don't lose the development right off of it simply because they don't develop it.

**Woods:** We have a motion on the floor. I'm not sure that I'm comfortable with it. It is parcel-based in its wording. It is in conflict with density-based planning and density-based yields.

**Holler:** Jack wants to use today's minimum lot size requirements in calculating future yields. I have a concern with saying that in a General Plan level policy.

**MOTION: (Phillips) "Conservation subdivisions may be allowed provided they do not produce in increases in plan densities. Footnote 1". In Favor— 14. Opposed—2.**

**Meeting concluded at 12pm.**